Notes for SSC members who could not come to the Fairbanks meeting in person

Tuesday Oct 2, 2012,

9AM Hajo gave a recap of what we want to get done and some news items

**Achieve this the next 3 days:** What functions do we see SEARCH serving? What activity do we see the SSC doing in the next 5-years?

**Concrete goal**: We want to focus on a dozen or so activities that we find compelling. We want a compelling mix of activities, risky, not-risky, and low-handing fruit. We want the structure and main points of a compelling proposal.

9:15AM Neil Swanberg called in and provided guidance. He was fairly positive and answered the questions that were prepared for him.

- Hajo asked advise from Neil on how to better engage IARPC? a) producing agency relevant results. b) write proposals. Make SEARCH the go-to place for the science. c) what things can be done? d) What could not happen without SEARCH intervening? f) **Prioritize.**

Bob B. asked the question: how can do prioritizing and get buy-in from community?, Neil answered: a) High system level thinking, b) complex logistical activities, c) prioritizing AON, d) SEARCH help to implement the GOAL of IARPC,

**MAKE YOURSELF INDISPENSIBLE.**

- SEARCH needs to facilitate the community priority questions, try to plan it, example of how SEARCH can interface with the community.

- Look at sea ice, where? A specific example of what Neil said.

- IPMC – More government people want to be involved, IPMC is becoming an open forum in the government, so it is changing, members of IPMC are in the various working groups. How to implement? It will at some point include non-federal workers.

- IPMC is the only link between SEARCH to IARPC, SEARCH needs more direct input to IARPC instead of IPMC as a go-between. IPMC – a SSC like link to the IARPC. IPMC is a leadership mode, engage more scientists within the agencies. What will SEARCH do scientifically? IPMC is getting more people volunteering on their own rather than being volunteered by their supervisors. How can we work with IPMC in coming months (structure and implementation strategy is in place along the way)?

- George K asked: how should we design this function/activity? Ans: Need more than one group working on this. Keep us informed? Give us more meat on the proposal topics, more communication. **High level synthesis: This is something we can do. Once we do that we can claim it as our product.**

- Hajo asked Neil: What are quantifiable metrics for success?

- How can we get together and move cutting edge science forward? SEARCH can say this?

10:25 HAJO – presented slides (Helen sent an email link to these slides which contain some very nice structural charts) to summarize – long-term scenarios planning, Consistent ideas about scenarios coming from several groups, science/climate change versus political governance on the two axis.

- It was suggested that we make sure our ‘slides’ are ‘**neutral’**

10:51 AM: Review of Mission and Goals, Process, Brainstorming…

We are good with vision and mission so nothing more to do there.

- Helen went through the process of how we will function the next few days.

- SEARCH Science Management Office – functions and activities document

- George K. introduced the document and the main comment was that we need more specific items for the ‘Activities’.

- Steve V. said we should look at CLIVAR and other such groups to see what they have done so that we can think more concretely about SEARCH activities.

Brainstorming on 6 functions discussed last week. Can we collapse them to the following three? More information in Helen’s notes.

1) Synthesis ($$ available, but no one is really getting to this activity in Neil’s opinion), target to research goals, AON- translate into value added products, a resource for citizen science,

2) Comprehensive Outlook

3) Emerging Science, What inter-disciplinary science needs to be done?

 - workshop bring people together…

12:15-1:30 lunch break

1:30-2:45 Brainstorming on specific activities (All together)

2:53-5PMish Brainstorming on specific activities (2 groups)

See Helen’s summary

 **General Comments: (Uma’s biases here)**

- People felt that there was much useful material in Neil’s comments

- We debated the use of ‘non-scientist’ professions who specialize in a) organizational architecture and b) relationship building to help us move SEARCH forward faster. There was no agreement as to whether this would be a good use of $$ (or at least concern that it would not be perceived of as a good use of money by the reviewers).

- We spent quite a bit of time discussing how to match people together, foster trust, and build relationships that allow cross-discipline collaboration.